UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,418	01/05/2001	Jorge M. Ferreira	60001.0009US01	4805

27488	7590	09/19/2006

MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER
PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/755,418	FERREIRA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CESAR B. PAULA	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 June 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5,7-12 and 14-20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3, 5, 7-12, and 14-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the RCE amendment filed on 6/26/2006.

This action is made Non-Final.

2.   In the amendment, claim 6 has been canceled. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-12, and 14-20 are pending

in the case. Claims 1, 11, and 19 are independent claims.

3.   The rejections of claims 1-3, 5-12, 14– 20, and 27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as

being anticipated by Star Office 5.1 Memorandum, and figs (published before1/5/2001), from

IDS submitted on 2/10/2005, hereinafter Staroffice, have been withdrawn as necessitated by the

amendment.

Drawings

4.   The drawings filed on 1/5/2001 have been approved by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.   The rejections of claims 1-3, 5-12, and 14-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first

paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement, have been withdrawn as

necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 1-3, 5, 7-12, 14– 20, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Star Office 5.1 Memorandum, and figs (published before1/5/2001), from IDS

submitted on 2/10/2005, hereinafter Staroffice, in view of Keene et al, hereinafter Keene

(USPub.# 2004/0049294 A1, 3/11/2004, continuation filed on 9/23/1999).

Regarding independent claim 1, Staroffice teaches software comment box for

deselecting an "Apply user data" checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing—*activating a privacy*

option comprising computer-implemented instructions provided by the document-generating

application, and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author's name, from the

properties of a file. The comment box is displayed superimposed within the document. The

author's name is replaced—*enable removal--* with more generic information, such as date and

time of creation/modification—*replacing the one or more pieces of personal information created*

by the document-generating application with generic information visible at each comment block

of the first document (memorandum, shots 1-2). Staroffice fails to explicitly teach *removing from*

the first document one or more pieces of information of the personal information without

deleting the document. Keene teaches the blocking or removing of data from a document

deemed sensitive by a user (0007,0048). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to combine Staroffice, and Keene, because of all the reasons

found in Keene including maintaining trade secrets, and confidentiality among business partners,

and allowing access to information in an organized and useful manner (005-0006).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an "Apply

user data" checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing—*saving the first document...--*, and replacing

or updating personal information, such as an author's name, from the properties of a file

(memorandum, shots 1-2).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an "Apply

user data" checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing, and replacing or updating personal

information, such as an author's name, from the properties of a file (memorandum, shots 1-2).

Regarding dependent claim 5, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an "Apply

user data" checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing—*saving the first document--*, and replacing

or updating personal information, such as an author's name-- *generic information made up of*

string of letters-- from the properties of a file (memorandum, shots 1-2).

Regarding dependent claim 7, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an "Apply

user data" checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing—*saving the first document removes one or*

more pieces of personal information from the first document when the first document is saved--,

and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author's name, from the properties of

a file (memorandum, shots 1-2).

Regarding dependent claim 8, Staroffice teaches replacing or updating personal

information, such as an author's name, in a comment box, from the properties of a file

(memorandum, shots 1-2). In other words, the same document—*template*-- is used to replace the

updated information thereby creating a new or second document containing the updated

information.

Claim 9 is directed towards a system for implementing the steps found in claim 1, and

therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 10 is directed towards a computer-readable medium having instructions for

executing the steps found in claim 1, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding independent claim 11, Staroffice teaches the default selection of a "Apply user

data" checkbox, in a comment box displayed superimposed on a document, enabling the display

of an author's name *–receiving input of one or more pieces of personal information into one or*

more data storage fields in response to a request for personal information from a document-

generating application--. Software dialog comment box is used for deselecting an "Apply user

data" checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing—*activate a computer-implemented privacy*

option, and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author's name, from the

properties of a file as displayed in the comment box. The author's name is replaced—*removal--* with more generic information, such as date and time of creation/modification—*replacing the removed personal information with generic information visible within the comment within the document* (memorandum, shots 1-2). Staroffice fails to explicitly teach *removes the one or more pieces of information of the personal information from the document without deleting the document.* Keene teaches the blocking or removing of data from a document deemed sensitive by a user (0007,0048). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Staroffice, and Keene, because of all the reasons found in Keene including maintaining trade secrets, and confidentiality among business partners, and allowing access to information in an organized and useful manner (005-0006).

Claims 12, 14-16 are directed towards a method equivalent to the steps found in claims 3, 5, 7, and 1 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claim 17 is directed towards a system for implementing the steps found in claim 11, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claims 18-20 is directed towards a computer-readable medium having instructions for executing the steps found in claims 11, and 1-2 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 27, which depends on claim 1, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an "Apply user data" checkbox in a dialog box, and clicking Ok for changing—

activating the privacy option enables removal of personal information from the comment box

without removing the comment-- and replacing or updating personal information, such as an

author's name, from the properties of a file, which are displayed in a dialog box—*comment*

box—along with a document (memorandum, shots 1-2). Staroffice fails to explicitly teach

removes the personal information from the document without deleting the document. Keene

teaches the blocking or removing of data from a document deemed sensitive by a user

(0007,0048). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine Staroffice, and Keene, because of all the reasons found in Keene including

maintaining trade secrets, and confidentiality among business partners, and allowing access to

information in an organized and useful manner (005-0006).

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant's arguments filed on 6/26/2006 have been considered but moot.   The

Applicants remark that Staroffice fails to teach or suggest displaying removal of information

from the document (pages 10-14). The Applicants are directed towards the rejection of this

limitation in light of the newly found reference.

Conclusion

I.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner

can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please

allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be

obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, go to http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair. Should you have any questions about

access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866

217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:
                        Commissioner for Patents
                        P.O. Box 1450
            Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
            Or faxed to:
• **(571)-273-8300 (for all Formal communications intended for entry)**

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
9/15/06